For the Northern District of California

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
8		
9		
10	ARCHIBALD CUNNINGHAM,	
11	Plaintiff,	No. C 14-03250 WHA
12	v.	
13	KEVIN SINGER, JOHN SCOTT	ORDER DENYING MOTION
14	TAMAKA WOODS, DONALD EVANS	FOR RECONSIDERATION
15	QUIDACHAY, LILLIAN SING, MING LEE. T. MICHAEL YUEN, CANTIL	
16	SAKAUYE, ANTHONY KLINE, JAMES RICHMOND, RECEIVER SPECIALISTS,	
17	and A. JAMES ROBERTSON, II,	
18	Defendants.	
19		

The undersigned judge's recent order dismissed this action as frivolous and declared plaintiff Archibald Cunningham, a licensed attorney, a vexatious litigant subject to pre-filing review (Dkt. No. 113). Judgment was entered (Dkt. No. 114). Now, Cunningham has filed a motion for reconsideration.

Under Rule 59(e), reconsideration is appropriate if the district court "(1) is presented with newly discovered evidence, (2) committed clear error or the initial decision was manifestly unjust, or (3) if there is an intervening change in controlling law." *School Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah County, Or. v. ACandS, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1263 (9th Cir. 1993). Under Rule 60(b), reconsideration is appropriate upon a showing of "(1) mistake, surprise, or excusable neglect; (2) newly discovered evidence; (3) fraud; (4) a void judgment; (5) a satisfied or discharged

judgment; or (6) 'extraordinary circumstances' which would justify relief." *Ibid*.

Cunningham's motion fails to satisfy any of the criteria for reconsideration. Cunningham again recites the same claims regarding defendants' alleged conspiracy to violate his constitutional rights through the unauthorized practice of law. None of these implausible allegations is new, and the motion fails to identify any new evidence warranting reconsideration. The motion then argues that the previous order's conclusion that Cunningham's claims were frivolous amounted to a manifest error of law. This order disagrees. If Cunningham feels differently, he can seek relief from our court of appeals. Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 26, 2015.

WILLIAM ALSUP

United States District Judge